

**From:** [PETERSON Jenn L](#)  
**To:** [Robert Gensemer](#)  
**Cc:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Subject:** RE: WOE framework attempt  
**Date:** 07/06/2006 09:50 PM

---

Hi Bob,

I took a look at the matrix, and unfortunately not enough was done for us to really understand the implications of the weighting. I think we needed to do a few additional receptors, and understand how the weighting criteria changed among them. We needed to see if they were relevant and applicable for all. Also, we needed to see if we were clear enough that if different users used the matrix they would come to similar conclusions (otherwise we would need to clarify or modify the criteria). At this point, I don't have time to do that exercise myself before tomorrow. Since there is such a deadline to get this out, I guess we should throw it to LWG to work on it together. However, I may spend some time on Monday trying to work through the matrix so we can be aware of the problem areas as we move forward.

We could talk tomorrow about some of the weights you assigned to the benthic community - I don't understand all of your thinking, so maybe discussions on that could point to some potential changes in the key. Let me know - I am available at 1:30.

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Robert Gensemer [mailto:[rgensemer@parametrix.com](mailto:rgensemer@parametrix.com)]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 3:22 PM  
**To:** PETERSON Jenn L  
**Subject:** WOE framework attempt

Hi Jennifer. I'm going to pass this along to you early since I'd rather get input from you first before going any farther. I tried out most, but not all, of the benthic community LOEs, and found the process to be pretty interesting. In general, I found the scoring relatively easy to do, but I was obviously more familiar and comfortable scoring the effects data than I did the exposure data--you are likely much more familiar there. I also added a few comments explaining to you why I made certain choices along the way.

Generally, I think the scheme is working pretty well for a first stab, except the the total dynamic range in the final integrated score is not very large. The final scores accurately--in my view--identify the highest vs. the lowest weighted LOES, but the range is only from about 2.9 - 4.5. In contrast, the effects vs. exposure scores were much more clear as to which LOEs were higher-weighted, so perhaps there is a flaw in the final integrated score calculation. Maybe its not appropriate to weight relevance, effects, and exposure scores equally? Relevance scores were all fairly high, so perhaps that swamps out some of the differences in effects or exposure.

Anyway, have a look and lets talk next Thursday or Friday as planned. Hope you have (had?) a good holiday weekend.

-Bob

\*\*\*\*\*

Robert W. Gensemer, Ph.D.  
Parametrix, Inc.  
33972 Texas Street SW  
Albany, OR 97321  
T 541-791-1667, x-6510  
F 541-791-1699  
C 541-760-1511

[rgensemer@parametrix.com](mailto:rgensemer@parametrix.com)

\*\*\*\*\*